

Summary of most important changes to PPM 9-5.1 from present RPT policy

- Adds statement following criteria of teaching, research, and service: “Assessments of teaching, research and service may consider the candidate’s conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.” PPM 9-5.1, A.2.c.iii. Findings from conduct proceedings go into the file. PPM 9-5.1, D.5.
- Authorizes participation but not voting in RPT meetings by other faculty if department procedures permit. PPM 9-5.1, A.3.a.i, ii and iii. This regularizes existing practice in School of Medicine for clinical faculty and some departments that allow junior faculty in for discussions.
- Reduces from two to one formal retention reviews before tenure, if department policy so chooses. PPM 9-5.1, B.2.a.
- Sets minimum requirements for informal reviews between formal reviews. PPM 9-5.1, B.1.
- Provides for a “triggered” formal review in the same year if a candidate “fails” an informal review. PPM 9-5.1, B.1.c.
- Faculty member’s cumulative file to be kept in department office. PPM 9-5.1, D.1.
- Retains past reviews in a cumulative file, so that reviewers see the whole progress of reviews. PPM 9-5.1, D.4.
- Requires external letters only in tenure and promotion reviews (not retention), but departments/colleges may choose to require them more often. Candidate retains right to request external letters unless only teaching is at issue. PPM 9-5.1, B.2.
- Notifies staff as well as students and all faculty of right to submit written statements about a candidate. (These are open to the candidate, who may reply in writing.) PPM 9-5.1, C.2.
- Adds notice to college representative to student senate as well as notice to dept. SAC. PPM 9-5.1, C.3.
- Eliminates the rule requiring absentee votes to be counted separately. Voting faculty feel this old rule compromises the anonymity of absentee voters. PPM 9-5.1, E. 4.
- Slightly strengthens the role of academic programs in the review of jointly appointed faculty. PPM 9-5.1, C.4., E.6.
- More clearly defines the role of the college advisory committee: “determine if the department reasonably applied its written substantive and procedural guidelines to each case...make its recommendations ...based upon its assessment whether the department’s recommendations are supported by the evidence presented... use [only] the department’s criteria (or college criteria if the college has college-wide instead of departmental criteria) in making its assessment.” “[R]eturn the file to the department [only] if documents required by policy are missing.” PPM 9-5.1, G.1.d.
- Defines a standard of review for the two types of cases heard by the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. PPM 9-5.1, H.2.a, b.
- Authorizes the senior vice president to return a file for further information and revoting if it is perceived as “incomplete or unclear.” PPM 9-5.1, H.3.
- Cases no longer return to the senior vice president for reconsideration of his/her initial recommendation before an appeal to Consolidated Hearing Committee. PPM 9-5.1, H.5.

- Makes senior vice president the last stop in positive retention cases. PPM 9-5.1, H. 5. The president would continue to review negative retention recommendations and all tenure and/or promotion cases. PPM 9-5.1, J.1, 2.
- Eliminates appeal by other parties (the SAC, majority of the departmental advisory committee, department chair or dean) to appeal positive retention recommendations. They could still appeal in promotion and/or tenure cases. PPM 9-5.1, I.2.